UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/050,182	03/26/1998	HIDETO OHNUMA	07977/242001	6531

20985 7590 07/14/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE
SUITE 500
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER	
KUNEMUND, ROBERT M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1765	26

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/050,182	OHNUMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M Kunemund	1765	

-- The MAILING DATE f this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Peri d for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 May 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-115* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *60-74* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-59 and 75-115* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

The Rejections

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 to 59 and 76 to 115 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 5,700,333. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference is the device formed and heating. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine

through routine experimentation the optimum, operable device formed as the instant claims form any device and heating in order to decrease heating time.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 to 16, 76, 77, 82 to 108, and 112 to 115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (5,700,333)..

The Yamazaki et al reference teaches a method of device formation. On a substrate, a layer of amorphous silicon is deposited and then catalysts are placed in contact with the silicon. The silicon is heated in order to crystallize the silicon. Then a gettering agent is added to the silicon layer. Then the structure is reheated to remove the catalyst. The second heating step is around 550°c, note entire reference. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior

art is the device formed. However, in the absence of unobvious results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable types of devices made in the Yamazaki et al reference in order to create devices with low impurity silicon layer.

Claims 17 to 59, 75, 78 to 81 and 109 to 111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al (5,700,333) in view of Zhang et al (5,569,936)

The Yamazaki et al reference is relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differs from the instant claims in the use of lasers to crystallize the silicon. However, the Zhang et al reference teaches catalyst crystallization of amorphous silicon by using lasers, note figures. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Yamazaki et al reference by the teachings of the Zhang et al reference to use lasers in order to decrease the time of crystallization.

Response to Applicants' Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed September 11, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argument concerning the gettering in view of the references is noted. However, the Yamazaki reference claims gettering a region or layer claim 1, this means that an area or patterning of the gettering metal is found in the reference. If there is a claimed limitation of a layer and a region, the region cannot be considered an entire layer. Also, at col 6 of the Yamazaki et al reference, it is taught to remove the areas, not layer, where the catalyst has been

gettered to the metal. This removal would inherently leave islands. The patent does specifically state in col. 6 that areas or regions are treated. It does not state treating the entire area. In fact, the patent states the crystal is damaged in the region of phosphorus. It does not state that the entire layer is damaged. Thus, when the reference states region on of ordinary skill in the art would not read that to be the entire layer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Kunemund whose telephone number is (703) 308-1091. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 to 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ben Utech, can be reached on (703) 308-3836. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-6357.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

ROBERT KUNEMUND
PRIMARY EXAMINER

RMK

July 8, 2003